



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/567,134	02/06/2006	Masahiko Igarashi	025416-00026	4553
4372	7590	04/23/2010		
ARENT FOX LLP 1050 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W. SUITE 400 WASHINGTON, DC 20036			EXAMINER MACARTHUR, VICTOR L.	
			ART UNIT 3679	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 04/23/2010	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DCIPDocket@arentfox.com

IPMatters@arentfox.com

Patent_Mail@arentfox.com

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/567,134

Applicant(s)

IGARASHI ET AL.

Examiner

VICTOR MACARTHUR

Art Unit

3679

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) VICTOR MACARTHUR.

(3) _____.

(2) WILLIAM DOYLE.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 20 April 2010.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: All.

Identification of prior art discussed: Beigang USPN 6142033.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Victor MacArthur/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3679

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiner's Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant's representative asked for assistance in moving the case to allowance noting that the previous examiner had previously noted allowable subject matter only to withdraw such indication in the non-final rejection mailed 12/28/2009.

The current examiner stated that the rejections on record appeared proper but agreed that the claims could be amended to overcome the previous Office Action rejections.

The examiner suggested overcoming the previous application of Beigang by claiming that there is an offsets between the radially inner points of inflection (p1 and p2 of applicant's fig.3) and an offset between the radially outermost points of inflection (at left most boundaries of L2 and L3) when fully installed such that 14 cannot slide axially on shaft 12 to close the offsets. The examiner suggested claiming the finally installed state by reciting the physical abutment that prevents further sliding of element 14 onto 12 rather than simply reciting --when fully installed-- so that there is no question as to what structurally is required to attain the fully installed state (i.e., not to merely recite a functional intended use limitation that would be open to interpretation).

The examiner noted that figure 1 seems to indicate that this abutment that prevents further sliding/installing is the contact of the rightmost conical surface of 14 (note labeled in figure 1 but shown as an inwardly tapered end of 14 in fig.3) against corner 22a (also not labeled in fig.1).

The examiner noted that figure 3 appeared to be in error in that it actually showed a space between 22a and the rightmost tapered surface of 14 whereas figure 1 clearly showed abutment. Accordingly, the examiner suggested correcting all of the cross-section figures (3, 4, 5, 16, 17, 24, 25, 34-38) to show the abutment between 14 and 22a that appears to be shown in figures (1, 15, 23 and 33). If there in fact is no abutment between the rightmost tapered face of 14 and 22a such that the cross-sectional figures (3, 4, 5, 16, 17, 24, 25, 34-38) are in fact correctly drawn, then applicant should identify what structural abutment prevents further sliding of 14 onto shaft 12 and thus prevents closing of the gap between P1 and P2 and set forth such abutment in the claims. Note that the way figures (3, 4, 5, 16, 17, 24, 25, 34-38) are currently drawn it appears that the gap between tapered endface of 14 and 22a is actually axially longer than the gap between P1 and P2 such that nothing structurally prevents the complete closing of the gap between P1 and P2 upon further sliding/installing.

The examiner noted that it is because of the lack of a structural abutment in the claims preventing further sliding that allows the previous examiner's rejection to properly be applied. The examiner stated that if applicant limits the claims to have the two radially inner and outer offsets and also recites a physical abutment preventing further axial sliding/installing of 14 on shaft 12 (with clear CONSISTANT antecedent basis in the written discription and drawings without the addition of new matter) then the previous Office Action rejections could be overcome. However, the examiner noted that currently it is not clear what abutment, if any, prevents the gap at P1 and P2 from being closed.